

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-19 are currently pending in this application. Claim 1 has been amended to correct antecedent basis. No new matter has been added through this amendment.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-19 were rejected as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,844,918 to Kato in view of the Applicants admitted prior art. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be removed in light of the arguments contained herein.

Claim 1 includes the features of establishing a pointer region configured to indicate an address of the data packet in the memory and transmitting a signal to the pointer region for re-transmission of the data packet. The Examiner has failed to address these features among others in claim 1. The Applicant in no way describes the pointers or pointer region in what is referred to by the Examiner as the Applicants admitted prior art (AAPA). As stated in the Application on pages 7-8 and illustrated in Figures 2 and 3, the retry buffers are integrated into memory and retry pointers direct retry signals to the appropriate memory address. The above features are not addressed by the Examiner, as Kato is silent as to these features and the AAPA is not even relevant to these features. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner specify where the above features are disclosed if this rejection is maintained.

Claim 7, includes the feature of a pointer region including a plurality of object pointers, one of the plurality of object pointers associated with an address of the portion of the data, wherein the one of the plurality of object pointers is configured to receive a signal indicating an error associated with the transmission of the selected portion of the data; and a scheduler module in communication with each of the plurality of object pointers, wherein the scheduler module is configured to schedule re-transmission of the selected portion of the data

from the memory in response to the signal indicating the error being received by the one of the plurality of object pointers. Here again the Examiner fails to address these features. The AAPA in no way mention anything remotely related to these features and Kato is silent as to these features. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner specify where the above features are disclosed if this rejection is maintained.

Claim 14 includes the features of a pointer associated with a memory address of the data packet; and a second microchip in communication with the first microchip through the serial link, the second microchip including an error verifying module configured to calculate a second value derived from the data packet received from the first microchip, the error verifying module further configured compare the second value to the first value, wherein if the first value and the second value are different the error verifying module transmits a signal to the pointer causing the data packet to be re-transmitted to the second microchip from the memory of the first microchip. Here again the Examiner has ignored the features of the claim and has relied on error correcting scheme of Kato, which fails to address anything remotely related to the retry pointers as specified in claim 14.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide details of where Kato discloses the features for the above independent claims. In addition, the AAPA has nothing to do with the retry pointers and the AAPA solely discusses the problems solved by the claimed invention. Accordingly, claims 2-6, 8-13, and 15-20 are patentable over Kato and the AAPA for at least the above reasons.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. A notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at **(408) 774-6921**. If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit

App. No. 10/616,269  
Amendment dated February 15, 2006  
Reply to Office action of November 15, 2005

Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. SUNMP227). A copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,  
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, L.L.P.

  
Michael L. Gencarella, Esq.  
Reg. No. 44,703

MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, L.L.P.  
710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200  
Sunnyvale, California 94085  
Telephone: (408) 749-6900  
**Customer Number 32291**